arXiv:1512.03180v1 [math.AP] 10 Dec 2015

ON SEMI-LINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATION ARISING FROM MICRO-ELECTROMECHANICAL SYSTEMS WITH CONTACTING ELASTIC MEMBRANE

Huyuan Chen

Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University Shanghai,
Shanghai, PR China
Email: chenhuyuan@yeah.net

Ying Wang

Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Universidad de Chile,
Santiago, Chile
Email: yingwang00@126.com

Feng Zhou

Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University,
Shanghai, PR China
Email: fzhou@math.ecnu.edu.cn

Abstract. This paper is concerned with the nonlinear elliptic problem $-\Delta u = \frac{\lambda}{(a-u)^2}$ on a bounded domain Ω of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. This problem arises from Micro-Electromechanical Systems devices in the case that the elastic membrane contacts the ground plate on the boundary. We analyze the properties of minimal solutions to this equation when $\lambda > 0$ and the function $a : \bar{\Omega} \to [0, 1]$ satisfying $a(x) \geq \kappa \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^\gamma$ for some $\kappa > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Our results show how the boundary decay of the membrane works on the solutions and pull-in voltage λ.

1. Introduction

Micro-Electromechanical Systems (MEMS) are often used to combine electronics with micro-size mechanical devices in the design of various types of microscopic machinery. They are successfully utilized in components of many commercial systems, including accelerometers for airbag deployment in automobiles, ink jet printer heads, optical switches, chemical sensors, etc. In MEMS devices, a key component is called the electrostatic actuation, which is based on an electrostatic-controlled tunable, it is a simple idealized electrostatic device. The upper part of this electrostatic device consists of a thin and deformable elastic membrane that is fixed along its boundary and which lies above a rigid grounded plate. This elastic membrane is modeled as a dielectric with a small but finite thickness. The upper surface of the membrane is coated with a negligibly thin metallic conducting film. When a voltage λ is applied to the conducting film, the thin dielectric membrane deflects towards the bottom plate, and when λ is increased beyond a certain critical value λ^*−known as pull-in voltage−the steady state of the elastic membrane is lost, and proceeds to touchdown or snap through at a finite time creating the so-called pull-in instability.

AMS Subject Classifications: 36J08, 35B50, 35J15.
Key words: MEMS; Pull-in voltage; Stable; Minimal solutions.

A mathematical model of the physical phenomena, leading to a partial differential equation for the dimensionless deflection of the membrane, was derived and analyzed in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15] and reference therein. In the damping-dominated limit, and using a narrow-gap asymptotic analysis, the dimensionless deflection u of the membrane on a bounded domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is found to satisfy the equation

$$-\Delta u = \frac{\lambda}{(1-u)^2} \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega \tag{1.1}$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition. Here the term on the right hand side of equation (1.1) is the Coulomb force. Later on, Ghoussoub and Guo in [4, 5] studied the nonlinear elliptic problem

$$-\Delta u = \frac{\lambda f(x)}{(1-u)^2} \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega \tag{1.2}$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition, which models a simple electrostatic MEMS device consisting of a thin dielectric elastic membrane with boundary supported at 0 above a rigid ground plate located at 1. Here Ω is a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and the function $f \geq 0$ represents the permittivity profile and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant which is increasing with respect to the applied voltage. We know that for any given suitable f, there exists a critical value λ^* (pull-in voltage) such that if $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, problem (1.2) is solvable, while for $\lambda > \lambda^*$, no solution for (1.2) exists.

In an effort to achieve better MEMS design, the membrane can be technologically fabricated into non-flat shape like the surface of a semi-ball, which contacts the ground plate along the boundary. In this paper, we study how the shape of membranes effects on the pull-in voltage. In what follows, we denote that Ω is a C^2 bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 1$, $\rho(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ for $x \in \Omega$, the function $a : \bar{\Omega} \to [0, 1]$ is in the class of $C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ and satisfies

$$a(x) \geq \kappa \rho(x)^\gamma, \quad \forall\ x \in \Omega \tag{1.3}$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Our purpose of this paper is to consider the minimal solutions to elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{\lambda}{(a-u)^2} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ 0 < u < a & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where parameter $\lambda > 0$ characterizes the relative strength of the electrostatic and mechanical forces in the system. Equation (1.4) models a MEMS device that the static deformation of the surface of membrane when it is applied voltage λ, where a is initially undeflected state of the elastic membrane that contacts the ground plate on the boundary. For this equation, we have the following existence results.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) with $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$ and $\kappa > 0$, then there exists a finite pull-in voltage $\lambda^* := \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma) > 0$ such that*

(i) for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, problem (1.4) admits a minimal solution u_λ and the mapping: $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is strictly increasing;

(ii) for $\lambda > \lambda^*$, there is no solution for (1.4);

(iii) assume more that there exists $c_0 \geq \kappa$ such that

$$a(x) \leq c_0 \rho(x)^\gamma, \quad x \in \Omega, \tag{1.5}$$

then there exists $\lambda_* := \lambda_*(\kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \lambda^*]$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, $u_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\text{for} \quad \gamma \neq \frac{1}{2}, \qquad \frac{\lambda}{c_1}\rho(x)^{\min\{1, 2-2\gamma\}} \leq u_\lambda(x) \leq c_1 \lambda \rho(x)^{\min\{1, 2-2\gamma\}}, \qquad \forall x \in \Omega;$$

$$\text{for} \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad \frac{\lambda}{c_1}\rho(x)\ln\frac{1}{\rho(x)} \le u_\lambda(x) \le c_1\lambda\rho(x)\ln\frac{1}{\rho(x)}, \qquad \forall x \in A_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $c_1 \ge 1$ *and* $A_{\frac{1}{2}} = \{x \in \Omega : \ \rho(x) < \frac{1}{2}\}$.

In particular, assume more that $\Omega = B_1(0)$ *and*

$$a(x) = \kappa(1-|x|^2)^\gamma, \qquad \forall x \in B_1(0),$$

then the mappings: $\gamma \mapsto \lambda_*(\kappa,\gamma)$, $\gamma \mapsto \lambda^*(\kappa,\gamma)$ *are decreasing and*

$$(2/3)^5\kappa^3 \le \lambda_*(\kappa,2/3) \le \lambda_*(\kappa,\gamma) \le \lambda^*(\kappa,\gamma) \le \lambda^*(\kappa,0) \le (4/3)^2 N\kappa^3.$$

We remark that the membrane contacts the ground plate on the boundary with decay rate ρ^γ, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, there still has a positive finite pull-in voltage λ^*, but the decay of a plays an important role in decay of minimal solution, the regularity of minimal solution and the estimate of λ^*. Theorem 1.1 shows that the membrane of the MEMS device could be designed as the surface of the unit semi-ball, that is,

$$\Omega = B_1(0) \quad \text{and} \quad a(x) = (1-|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which is equivalent to the case that $a(x) = \rho(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so there exists a positive finite pull-in voltage λ^*. However, the decay rate of function a determined completely nonexistence of pull-in voltage when $\gamma > \frac{2}{3}$. Precisely, we have the following non-existence result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that* $a \in C(\bar\Omega)$ *is positive and satisfies (1.5) with* $\gamma \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ *and* $c_0 > 0$. *Then problem (1.4) admits no nonnegative solution for any* $\lambda > 0$.

We notice that for $\gamma \le \frac{2}{3}$ and fixed κ, the finite pull-in voltage λ^* depends on γ, however, when $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, $\lambda^* > 0$ and $\lambda^* = 0$ for $\gamma > \frac{2}{3}$. Therefore, there is a gap at $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$. From Theorem 1.2, we learn that the membrane of the MEMS device should be made steeply enough near the boundary, otherwise the device does not work.

As normal, it is challenging to study the extremal solution, i.e., the solution of (1.4) when $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Especially, the decay of function a makes this issue more subtle. From Theorem 1.1, we observe that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is increasing and uniformly bounded by function a, then it is well-defined that

$$u_{\lambda^*} := \lim_{\lambda\to\lambda^*} u_\lambda \quad \text{in} \ \ \bar\Omega, \tag{1.6}$$

where u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4) with $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$. Our final purpose in this paper is to prove that u_{λ^*} is a solution of (1.4) in some weak sense and it is called the extremal solution. The extremal solution always is found in a weak sense and then it could be improved the regularity until to the classical sense when the dimension N is suitable.

Definition 1.1. *A function* u *is a weak solution of (1.4) if* $0 \le u \le a$ *and*

$$\int_\Omega u(-\Delta\xi)dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\xi}{(a-u)^2}dx, \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^2(\Omega),$$

where $C_c^2(\Omega)$ *is the space of all* C^2 *functions with compact support in* Ω.

A solution (or weak solution) u *of (1.4) is stable (resp. semi-stable) if*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx > \int_\Omega \frac{2\lambda\varphi^2}{(a-u)^3}dx, \quad (\text{resp. } \ge) \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}.$$

We make use of the functions' space $C_c^2(\Omega)$ in Definition 1.1 replacing $C_0^2(\Omega) := C^2(\Omega) \cap C_0(\Omega)$, used in the case of $a \equiv 1$, to avoid the singularity at the boundary of $\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}$.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, the function $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and(1.5) with $c_0 \geq \kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4) and u_{λ^*} is given by (1.6). Then*

(i) u_{λ^*} is a weak solution of (1.4) and $u_{\lambda^*} \in W_0^{1,\frac{N}{N-\beta}}(\Omega)$ for any $\beta \in (0, \gamma)$.
(ii) u_λ is a stable solution of (1.4) with $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$.
(iii) if $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, we have that $\lambda^* = \lambda_*$, u_{λ^*} is a semi-stable weak solution of (1.4).

Assume more that $1 \leq N \leq 7$, $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and $a(x) = \kappa(1 - |x|^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}$, u_{λ^*} is a classical solution of (1.4).

We note that (i) the extremal solution u_{λ^*} is a weak solution but in a weaker sense comparing with the case $a \equiv 1$; (ii) the main difficulty to study the stability of u_λ with $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ arises from the decay on the boundary of a and to overcome this difficult, we make use of the generalized Hardy's inequality; (iii) in the case of $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, the regularity of the extremal solution could be improved into classical sense for $1 \leq N \leq 7$, the same range of the dimension with the case $a \equiv 1$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to do the estimate for $\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}]$ when $\tau \in (0, 2)$ and then we prove that there exists pull-in voltage λ^* such that problem (1.4) admits a minimal solution when $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$. We also analyze the boundary decay of the minimal solution. In Section 3, we do the estimate for λ_* and λ^* when $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and $a(x) = \kappa(1 - |x|)^\gamma$. In Section 4, we study the properties of u_{λ^*}, including its regularity and stability.

2. Existence

Denote by G_Ω the Green kernel of $-\Delta$ in $\Omega \times \Omega$ and by $\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\cdot]$ the Green operator defined as

$$\mathbb{G}_\Omega[f](x) = \int_\Omega G_\Omega(x, y) f(y) dy, \quad \forall f \in L^1(\Omega, \rho^{-1} dx).$$

To do the existence of a minimal solution of problem (1.4), the following estimates play an important role.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\tau \in (0, 2)$, $A_{\frac{1}{2}} = \{x \in \Omega : \ \rho(x) < \frac{1}{2}\}$. For $x \in A_{\frac{1}{2}}$, we denote*

$$\varrho_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} \rho(x)^{\min\{1,\tau\}} & \text{if} \quad \tau \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2), \\ \rho(x) \ln \frac{1}{\rho(x)} & \text{if} \quad \tau = 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and we make C^1 extension of ϱ_τ into $\Omega \setminus A_{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $\varrho_\tau > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus A_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Then there exists $c_\tau > 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_\tau} \varrho_\tau(x) \leq \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) \leq c_\tau \varrho_\tau(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Proof. Since the domain Ω is C^2, then there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that the distance function $\rho(\cdot)$ is C^2 in $A_{\delta_1} = \{x \in \Omega : \ \rho(x) < \delta_1\}$. Let us define

$$V_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} l(x), & x \in \Omega \setminus A_{\delta_1}, \\ \rho(x)^\tau, & x \in A_{\delta_1}, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where τ is a parameter in $(0, 2)$ and l is a positive function such that V_τ is C^2 in Ω. Now we do the estimate of $-\Delta V_\tau$ near the boundary of Ω. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $e_N = (0, \cdots, 0, 1)$ is the unit normal vector at 0 pointing inside.

We observe that there exists $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that for any $t \in (0, \delta_2)$, $te_N \in A_{\delta_1}$ and $V_\tau(te_N) = \rho(te_N)^\tau = t^\tau$. Then

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_\tau(te_N)}{\partial x_N^2} = \tau(\tau-1)t^{\tau-2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\frac{\partial^2 V_\tau(te_N)}{\partial x_i^2}| \le c_2, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, N-1,$$

where $c_2 > 0$ is independent of t. Thus,

$$\tau(\tau-1)t^{\tau-2} - c_2 \le \Delta V_\tau(te_N) \le \tau(\tau-1)t^{\tau-2} + c_2.$$

Since Ω is a C^2 bounded domain, $\partial\Omega$ is compact and then

$$\tau(\tau-1)\rho(x)^{\tau-2} - c_2 \le \Delta V_\tau(x) \le \tau(\tau-1)\rho(x)^{\tau-2} + c_2, \quad \forall x \in A_{\delta_2}. \tag{2.3}$$

For $\tau \in (0,1)$, we observe that $\tau(\tau-1) < 0$ and by (2.3),

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau(1-\tau)\rho(x)^{\tau-2} \le -\Delta V_\tau(x) \le 2\tau(1-\tau)\rho(x)^{\tau-2}, \quad \forall x \in A_{\delta_2}.$$

Combining with the fact that $-\Delta \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}] = \rho^{\tau-2}$ in Ω, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2\tau(1-\tau)}(-\Delta V_\tau) \le -\Delta \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}] \le \frac{2}{\tau(1-\tau)}(-\Delta V_\tau) \quad \text{in} \quad A_{\delta_2}.$$

For $x \in \partial\Omega$, we have that $V_\tau(x) = 0$ and $G_\Omega(x,y) = 0$ for $y \in \Omega$ and then

$$\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) = \int_\Omega G_\Omega(x,y)\rho(y)^{\tau-2}dy = 0.$$

For $x \in \Omega$ satisfying $\rho(x) = \delta_2$, we have that $V_\tau(x) = {\delta_2}^\tau$ and then

$$\frac{1}{c_3}V_\tau(x) \le \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) \le c_3 V_\tau(x) \quad \text{for } \rho(x) = \delta_2, \tag{2.4}$$

where $c_3 > 1$. By Comparison Principle, there exists $c_4 > 1$ depends on τ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_4}V_\tau \le \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}] \le c_4 V_\tau \quad \text{in} \quad A_{\delta_2}. \tag{2.5}$$

Since $\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}]$ and V_τ is bounded in $\Omega \setminus A_{\delta_2}$, then (2.5) holds in Ω.

For $\tau \in (1,2)$, by the fact of (2.3), we observe that

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau(\tau-1)\rho(x)^{\tau-2} \le \Delta V_\tau(x) \le 2\tau(\tau-1)\rho(x)^{\tau-2}, \quad \forall x \in A_{\delta_2}.$$

Letting $W_\tau = \mathbb{G}_\Omega[1] - V_\tau$, then there exists $c_5 > 1$ depends on τ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_5}\rho(x)^{\tau-2} \le -\Delta W_\tau(x) = -1 + \Delta V_\tau(x) \le c_5\rho(x)^{\tau-2}, \quad \forall x \in A_{\delta_2}.$$

By the fact that $-\Delta \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}] = \rho^{\tau-2}$ in Ω, we have

$$\frac{1}{c_6}W_\tau(x) \le \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) \le c_6 W_\tau(x), \quad \forall x \in \partial A_{\delta_2} \tag{2.6}$$

for some $c_6 > 1$ depends on τ. Using the Comparison Principle, there exists $c_7, c_8 > 1$ depend on τ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_8}\rho(x) \le \frac{1}{c_7}W_\tau(x) \le \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) \le c_7 W_\tau(x) \le c_8\rho(x), \quad x \in A_{\delta_2},$$

and then

$$\frac{1}{c_8}\rho(x) \le \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{\tau-2}](x) \le c_8\rho(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

For $\tau = 1$, we redefine

$$V_1(x) = \begin{cases} l(x), & x \in \Omega \setminus A_{\delta_1}, \\ \rho(x) \ln \frac{1}{\rho(x)}, & x \in A_{\delta_1}, \end{cases}$$

where l is a positive function such that V_1 is C^2 in Ω. By direct computation, there exist $\delta_3 \in (0, \delta_1)$ and $c_9 > 0$ such that

$$\rho(x)^{-1} - c_9 \leq -\Delta V_1(x) \leq \rho(x)^{-1} + c_9, \quad \forall x \in A_{\delta_3}.$$

Then it follows by Comparison Principle that

$$\frac{1}{c_{10}} \rho \ln \frac{1}{\rho} \leq \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1}] \leq c_{10} \rho \ln \frac{1}{\rho} \qquad \text{in} \quad A_{\delta_3}$$

for some $c_{10} > 1$. The proof is complete. □

By Lemma 2.1, we have the following results.

Corollary 2.1. *For $\gamma \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, we have that*

$$\lim_{x \in \Omega, x \to \partial\Omega} \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}](x) \rho(x)^{-\gamma} = +\infty. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Let $\tau = 2 - 2\gamma$, by $\gamma \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, we have that $\tau < \gamma < 1$. Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}](x) \geq c_{11} \rho(x)^\tau, \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

for some $c_{11} > 0$, which implies (2.7). □

Now we are ready to show the existence of pull-in voltage λ^* to problem (1.4) such that (1.4) admits a solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and no solution for $\lambda > \lambda^*$.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) with $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, then there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ such that problem (1.4) admits at least one solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and no solution for $\lambda > \lambda^*$. Moreover,*

$$\lambda^* \leq \frac{\int_\Omega a(x) dx}{\int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a(x)^2} dx}. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. Let $v_0 \equiv 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ and

$$v_1 = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] > 0,$$

by (1.3) and Lemma 2.1,

$$v_1 = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}] \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{12} \varrho_{2-2\gamma}, \tag{2.9}$$

where $c_{12} > 0$ depending on γ and $\varrho_{2-2\gamma}$ is given by (2.1).

For $0 < \gamma \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\gamma \neq \frac{1}{2}$, we observe that $\min\{1, 2 - 2\gamma\} \geq \gamma$ and by (2.9),

$$v_1(x) \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{12} \rho(x)^{\min\{1, 2-2\gamma\}} \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{13} \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad x \in \Omega.$$

For $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, we see that $2 - 2\gamma = 1$ and by (2.9),

$$v_1(x) \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{12} \rho(x) \log \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{13} \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad x \in \Omega.$$

Then

$$v_1(x) \leq \frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{13} \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad x \in \Omega.$$

Fixed $\mu \in (0,\kappa)$, there exists $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\lambda}{\kappa^2} c_{13} \le \mu < \kappa, \quad \forall \lambda < \lambda_1,$$

then for any $\lambda < \lambda_1$,

$$v_1(x) \le \mu \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Let $v_2 = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-v_1)^2}]$, by the fact that $a(x) \ge \kappa \rho(x)^\gamma > \mu \rho(x)^\gamma \ge v_1(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and and Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$v_1 = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] \le v_2 \le \frac{\lambda}{(\kappa-\mu)^2} \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}] \le \frac{\lambda}{(\kappa-\mu)^2} c_{12} \varrho_{2-2\gamma} \le \frac{\lambda}{(\kappa-\mu)^2} c_{14} \rho^\gamma \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

for $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$. We observe that there exists $\lambda_2 \in (0, \lambda_1]$ such that

$$\frac{\lambda}{(\kappa-\mu)^2} c_{14} \le \mu < \kappa, \quad \forall \lambda < \lambda_2.$$

Then for any $\lambda < \lambda_2$, we obtain that

$$v_2(x) \le \mu \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Iterating above process, we have that

$$v_n := \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-v_{n-1})^2}] \ge v_{n-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$v_n(x) \le \mu \rho(x)^\gamma, \qquad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ converges, denoting by $u_\lambda = \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n$, then u_λ is a classical solution of (1.4).

We claim that u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4), that is, for any positive solution u of (1.4), we always have $u_\lambda \le u$. Indeed, there holds $u \ge v_0$ and then

$$u = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-u)^2}] \ge \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] = v_1.$$

We may show inductively that

$$u \ge v_n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The claim follows.

Similarly, if problem (1.4) has a super solution u for $\lambda_0 > 0$, then (1.4) admits a minimal solution u_λ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$. As a consequence, the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is increasing. So we may define

$$\lambda^* = \sup\{\lambda > 0 : \text{ (1.4) has a minimal solution for } \lambda\},$$

which is the largest λ such that problem (1.4) has minimal positive solution, and $\lambda^* > 0$.

For $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda^*$, we know that $0 \le u_{\lambda_1} \le u_{\lambda_2} \le a$ in Ω, then

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(u_{\lambda_2} - u_{\lambda_1}) &= \frac{\lambda_2}{(a-u_{\lambda_2})^2} - \frac{\lambda_1}{(a-u_{\lambda_1})^2} \\ &\ge \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{(a-u_{\lambda_1})^2} \ge \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{a^2} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$u_{\lambda_2} - u_{\lambda_1} \ge (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \mathbb{G}_\Omega[a^{-2}] > 0. \tag{2.10}$$

It infers that $u_\lambda < a$ in Ω for any $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and by the interior regularity, we have that $u_\lambda \in C^{2,\gamma'}_{loc}(\Omega)$ for any $\gamma' < \gamma$.

Now we prove that $\lambda^* < +\infty$. If not, then for any $\lambda > 0$, problem (1.4) has the minimal solution u_λ. Let $A_\delta = \{x \in \Omega : \rho(x) < \delta\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\eta_n = 1 \ \text{ in } \Omega \setminus A_{1/n}, \quad \eta_n = 0 \ \text{ in } A_{1/2n}, \quad \eta_n \in C^2(\Omega), \tag{2.11}$$

and $\xi_n = \mathbb{G}_\Omega[1]\eta_n$ in Ω, we observe that $\xi_n \in C_c^2(\Omega)$ and

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi_n)dx = \int_\Omega u_\lambda(\eta_n - \nabla\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1]\cdot\nabla\eta_n + (-\Delta\eta_n)\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1])dx.$$

By the fact that $|\nabla\eta_n| \le c_{15}n$, $|(-\Delta)\eta_n| \le c_{16}n^2$ and $\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1] \le c_{17}\rho$ in Ω, then we have that

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi_n)dx \le \int_\Omega u_\lambda dx + c_{15}n\int_{A_{1/n}} u_\lambda dx + c_{18}n^2\int_{A_{1/n}} u_\lambda\rho dx \le c_{19}, \tag{2.12}$$

where $c_{15}, c_{16}, c_{17}, c_{18}, c_{19} > 0$ are independent on n.

Since u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4), then

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi_n)dx = \int_\Omega \nabla u_\lambda\cdot\nabla\xi_n dx = \int_\Omega(-\Delta u_\lambda)\xi_n dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\xi_n}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx$$

Passing to the limit of $n \to \infty$ and combining with (2.12), we see that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1]}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \le c_{20}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega a(x)dx \ge \int_\Omega u_\lambda(x)dx &= \int_\Omega \mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)(-\Delta u_\lambda)(x)dx\\ &= \lambda\int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{[a(x)-u_\lambda(x)]^2}dx \ge \lambda\int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a^2(x)}dx,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\lambda \le \frac{\int_\Omega a(x)dx}{\int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a^2(x)}dx}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda^* \le \frac{\int_\Omega a(x)dx}{\int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a^2(x)}dx}.$$

Similar proof as the claim, we know that problem (1.4) has the minimal solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and no solution for $\lambda > \lambda^*$. This end the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By contradiction. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, if there exists some $\lambda > 0$ such that problem (1.4) has a solution u_λ satisfying $0 < u_\lambda < a$ in Ω, then

$$\lambda\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] \le \lambda\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}] = u_\lambda < a \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{2.13}$$

On the other hand, by (1.5), we have that

$$\lambda\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] \ge \frac{\lambda}{c_0^2}\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}].$$

For $\gamma \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, using Corollary 2.1 and (2.13), we deduce that

$$\lim_{x\in\Omega, x\to\partial\Omega} a(x)\rho(x)^{-\gamma} = +\infty,$$

which contradicts (1.5). This ends the proof. □

We next do the boundary decay estimate for u_λ. To this end, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that the function $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) with $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$ and u is a super solution of (1.4) with $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$u \le \theta a \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \tag{2.14}$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, then (1.4) admits the minimal solution u_λ such that

$$u_\lambda \le c_{20}\varrho_{2-2\gamma} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \tag{2.15}$$

for some $c_{20} > 0$, where $\varrho_{2-2\gamma}$ is defined by (2.1).

Proof. Since problem (1.4) admits a super solution u satisfying (2.14) for some $\lambda > 0$, as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we know that (1.4) has the minimal solution u_λ and then

$$u_\lambda \le u \le \theta a, \qquad u_\lambda = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}] \le \lambda \kappa^{-2}(1-\theta)^{-2}\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}],$$

by the fact of (1.3). Using Lemma 2.1 with $\tau = 2 - 2\gamma$, we imply that (2.15) holds. The proof is complete. □

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that the function $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and(1.5) with $c_0 \ge \kappa > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$. Then*
(i) for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, there exists $c_{21} \ge 1$ dependent on γ such that

$$\frac{\lambda}{c_{21}}\varrho_{2-2\gamma}(x) \le u_\lambda(x) \le c_{21}\lambda\rho(x)^\gamma, \quad \forall x \in \Omega;$$

(ii) there exists $\lambda_* \le \lambda^*$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$,

$$\frac{\lambda}{c_{21}}\varrho_{2-2\gamma}(x) \le u_\lambda(x) \le c_{21}\lambda\varrho_{2-2\gamma}(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega \tag{2.16}$$

where $\varrho_{2-2\gamma}$ is defined by (2.1).

Proof. Lower bound. By Proposition 2.1, we see that (1.4) admits the minimal solution u_λ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, which is approximated by an increasing sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ defined by

$$v_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_n = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{(a-v_{n-1})^2}].$$

By the fact of (1.5) and Lemma 2.1 with $\tau = 2 - 2\gamma$, we have that

$$u_\lambda \ge v_1 = \lambda \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\frac{1}{a^2}] \ge \lambda c_0^2 \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-2\gamma}] \ge c_{22}\lambda\varrho_{2-2\gamma} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega$$

for some $c_{22} \in (0,1)$ dependent on γ.

Upper bound. From the proof of Proposition 2.1, for $\lambda > 0$ small, we see that $u_\lambda(x) \le \mu\rho(x)^\gamma$, $x \in \Omega$, for some $\mu \in (0, \kappa)$, then there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$u_\lambda(x) \le \theta a(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$u_\lambda \le c_{23}\varrho_{2-2\gamma} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{2.17}$$

Let us define

$$\lambda_* = \sup\{\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*) : \limsup_{x \in \Omega, x \to \partial\Omega} u_\lambda(x)\rho(x)^{-\gamma} < \kappa\},$$

we observe that $\lambda_* \le \lambda^*$ and (2.17) holds for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. This ends the proof. □

3. Estimates for λ^* and λ_* when $\Omega = B_1(0)$

In this section, we do the estimates for λ^* and λ_* in the case that $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and

$$a(x) = \kappa(1 - |x|^2)^\gamma. \tag{3.1}$$

In this case, the function a represents the upper semi-sphere type shape in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We have following monotonicity results.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $\Omega = B_1(0)$, the function a satisfies (3.1) with $\kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma)$. Then*

(i) the mappings: $\gamma \mapsto \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma)$ and $\gamma \mapsto \lambda_*(\kappa, \gamma)$ are decreasing for fixed $\kappa > 0$;

(ii) the mapping: $\kappa \mapsto \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma)$ and $\kappa \mapsto \lambda_*(\kappa, \gamma)$ are increasing for fixed $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$.

Proof. Let $0 < \gamma_2 \le \gamma_1 \le \frac{2}{3}$, for $\lambda \in (0, \min\{\lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_1), \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_2)\})$, denote by u_1, u_2 the minimal solutions of (1.4) with $a = a_1$ and $a = a_2$ respectively, where $a_1(x) = \kappa(1 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_1}$ and $a_2(x) = \kappa(1-|x|^2)^{\gamma_2}$. Since $\gamma_2 \le \gamma_1$, then $a_1 \le a_2$ in $B_1(0)$ and for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_1))$,

$$-\Delta u_1 = \frac{\lambda}{(a_1 - u_1)^2} \ge \frac{\lambda}{(a_2 - u_1)^2} \quad \text{in } B_1(0),$$

that is, u_1 is a super solution of (1.4) with $a = a_2$, for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_1))$. By the same argument in Proposition 2.1, problem (1.4) with $a = a_2$ admits the minimal solution for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_1))$. Thus,

$$\lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_2) \ge \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_1),$$

by the definition of $\lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma_2))$. As a consequence, we obtain that the mapping $\gamma \mapsto \lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma)$ is decreasing for fixed $\kappa > 0$.

It is similar to obtain the other assertions. □

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and the function a satisfies (3.1) with $\kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$. Then*

$$\lambda^*(\kappa, \gamma) \le \frac{4N\kappa^3}{3}\mathcal{B}(\frac{1}{2}, 2 - 2\gamma), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta function.

Proof. From (2.8), we only need to do the estimates of $\int_{B_1(0)} a(x)dx$ and $\int_{B_1(0)} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a^2(x)}dx$. Since a satisfies (3.1), by direct computation, we have that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} a(x)dx = \frac{2}{3}\kappa|S^{N-1}|, \tag{3.3}$$

where S^{N-1} is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

On the other hand, we see that there exists $c_{27} > 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[1](x) = \frac{1}{2N}(1 - |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in B_1(0),$$

then

$$\int_{B_1(0)} \frac{\mathbb{G}_\Omega[1](x)}{a^2(x)}dx = \frac{1}{2N\kappa^2}\int_{B_1(0)} (1 - |x|^2)^{1-2\gamma}dx = \frac{|S^{N-1}|}{4N\kappa^2}\mathcal{B}(\frac{1}{2}, 2 - 2\gamma),$$

which, combining with (3.3), (2.8), implies (3.2). □

From Proposition 3.1, the mapping $\gamma \mapsto \lambda_*(\kappa, \gamma)$ is decreasing, so our interest is to evaluate the lower bound for λ_* when $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and the function a satisfies (3.1) with $\kappa > 0$ and $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$. Then*

$$\lambda_*(\kappa, \frac{2}{3}) \geq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^5 \kappa^3. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Let $w_t(r) = t\kappa(1-r^2)^{2/3}$ with $t \in (0,1)$, then for $x \in B_1(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_t(|x|) &= \frac{8}{9}t\kappa(1-|x|^2)^{-4/3} + \frac{4}{3}t\kappa(N-\frac{2}{3})(1-|x|^2)^{-1/3} \\ &\geq \frac{8}{9}t\kappa(1-|x|^2)^{-4/3} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda}{(a(x)-w(|x|))^2} \leq (1-t)^{-2}\kappa^{-2}\lambda(1-|x|^2)^{-4/3},$$

thus, if

$$\lambda \leq \lambda_t := \frac{8}{9}t(1-t)^2\kappa^3, \tag{3.5}$$

w_t is a super solution of the equation (1.4). In fact, choose $t = \frac{1}{3}$, we get the optimal $\lambda_t = \frac{2^5}{3^4}\kappa^3$ and then by Lemma 2.2 to obtain that problem (1.4) admits the minimal solution u_{λ_t}. Therefore, $\lambda_* \geq \lambda_t$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \geq \kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$, λ_* is given in Theorem 1.1 and u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4) with $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. Then $u_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and there exists $c_{31} > 0$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega \frac{u_\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \leq c_{31}\lambda \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx \leq c_{31}\lambda^2.$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$, by (2.16), we have that

$$u_\lambda(x) \leq c_{21}\lambda\rho(x)^{\min\{1, 2-2\gamma\}}, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Since $\kappa\rho(x)^\gamma \leq a(x) \leq c_0\rho(x)^\gamma$ for $x \in \Omega$, then there exists $\theta_1 \in (0,1)$ such that $u_\lambda < \theta_1 a$ in $A_\delta = \{x \in \Omega : \rho(x) < \delta\}$ for some $\delta > 0$ small. Moreover, since $u_\lambda < a$ in Ω, then there exists $\theta_2 \in (0,1)$ such that $u_\lambda \leq \theta_2 a$ in $\Omega \setminus A_\delta$. Let $\theta = \max\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, then we have that $u_\lambda \leq \theta a$ in Ω and then

$$a - u_\lambda \geq (1-\theta)a \geq (1-\theta)\kappa\rho^\gamma \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{u_\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \leq \int_\Omega \frac{c_{21}\lambda\rho(x)^{\min\{1,2-2\gamma\}}}{(1-\theta)^2\kappa^2\rho(x)^{2\gamma}}dx := c_{24}\lambda < +\infty, \tag{3.7}$$

by the fact that $\min\{1, 2-2\gamma\} - 2\gamma > -1$. Taking a sequence $\{\xi_n\}_n \subset C_c^2(\Omega)$ which converges to u_λ as $n \to \infty$, since u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4), then

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\lambda \cdot \nabla \xi_n dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\xi_n}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx.$$

Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda u_\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \leq c_{24}\lambda^2.$$

For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.16), we have that

$$u_\lambda(x) \leq c_{21}\lambda\rho(x)\log\frac{1}{\rho(x)}, \quad x \in \Omega,$$

similarly, there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that $u_\lambda \le \theta a$ in Ω and then (3.6) holds. Then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{u_\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \le \int_\Omega \frac{c_{21}\lambda}{(1-\theta)^2\kappa^2}\log\frac{1}{\rho(x)}dx \le c_{24}\lambda \tag{3.8}$$

and then we have that $\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx \le c_{24}\lambda^2$. The proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The existence of the minimal solution for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$ and the nonexistence for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ follow by Proposition 2.1. The proof of Theorem 1.1 (*iii*) sees Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 3.1. The estimates of λ^* and λ_* see Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.2. □

4. Properties of minimal solution

4.1. **Regularity.** In this subsection, we study the solutions of (1.4) when $\lambda = \lambda^*$.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that the function $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega)\cap C(\bar\Omega)$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \ge \kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$ and u_{λ^*} is given by (1.6). Then u_{λ^*} is a weak solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Moreover, for any $\beta \in (0,\gamma)$, there exists $c_\beta > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_{\lambda^*}\|_{W^{1,\frac{N}{N-\beta}}(\Omega)} \le c_\beta \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\rho^{1-\beta}}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^2}dx \le c_\beta. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. For any $\beta \in (0,\gamma)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $\xi_n = \mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1-\beta}]\eta_n$, where η_n is defined by (2.11), we observe that $\xi_n \in C_c^2(\Omega)$ and

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi_n)dx = \int_\Omega u_\lambda(\rho^{-1-\beta}\eta_n - \nabla\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1-\beta}]\cdot\nabla\eta_n + (-\Delta)\eta_n\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1-\beta}])dx.$$

Using Lemma 2.1 with $\tau = 1-\beta \in (1/3,1)$, we have that $\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1-\beta}] \le c_{25}\rho^{1-\beta}$ in Ω. Combining with the fact that $|\nabla\eta_n| \le c_{16}n$, $|(-\Delta)\eta_n| \le c_{17}n^2$ and $0 < u_\lambda(x) < a(x) \le c_0\rho(x)^\gamma$ for $x \in \Omega$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi_n)dx &\le c_0\int_\Omega \rho^{\gamma-1-\beta}dx + c_{26}n\int_{A_{1/n}}\rho^{\gamma-\beta}dx + c_{26}n^2\int_{A_{1/n}}\rho^{1-\beta+\gamma}dx\\ &\le \bar c_\beta,\end{aligned}$$

where $c_{26}, \bar c_\beta > 0$ independent on n and $\bar c_\beta$ satisfies $\bar c_\beta \to +\infty$ as $\beta \to \gamma^-$. Thus,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\mathbb{G}_\Omega[\rho^{-1-\beta}]}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \le \bar c_\beta$$

and then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\rho^{1-\beta}}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \le \frac{\bar c_\beta}{c_{25}}. \tag{4.3}$$

By Theorem 1.1, we see that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is increasing and uniformly bounded by the function a, which is in $L^1(\Omega)$, then

$$u_\lambda \to u_{\lambda^*} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } \lambda \to \lambda^*$$

and then for any $\xi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi)dx \to \int_\Omega u_{\lambda^*}(-\Delta\xi)dx \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \lambda^*. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, we observe that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}$ is increasing and by (4.3),

$$\frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2} \to \frac{\lambda^*}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^2} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \quad \text{as } \lambda \to \lambda^*,$$

Then (4.3) deduces that

$$\frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2} \to \frac{\lambda^*}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^2} \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega,\, \rho^{1-\beta}dx) \quad \text{as } \lambda \to \lambda^*$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\lambda^* \rho^{1-\beta}}{(a-u_\lambda^*)^2}dx \le \frac{\bar{c}_\beta}{c_{25}}, \tag{4.5}$$

thus, for any $\xi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\lambda \xi}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx \to \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda^* \xi}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^2}dx \quad \text{as } \lambda \to \lambda^*. \tag{4.6}$$

Since u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4),

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta\xi)dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\xi}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx, \qquad \forall\, \xi \in C_c^2(\Omega),$$

passing to the limit as $\lambda \to \lambda^*$, combining with (4.4) and (4.6), then u_{λ^*} is a weak solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$.

By [2, Theorem 2.6], for any $\beta' \in (\beta, \gamma)$, there exists $c_{27} > 0$ such that

$$\||\nabla u_{\lambda^*}|\|_{M^{\frac{N}{N-\beta'}}(\Omega)} \le c_{27}\|(a-u_{\lambda^*})^{-2}\|_{L^1(\Omega,\, \rho^{1-\beta'}dx)},$$

where $M^{\frac{N}{N-\beta'}}(\Omega)$ is the Marcinkiewicz space of exponent $\frac{N}{N-\beta'}$. Then, by (4.5), we have that

$$\||\nabla u_{\lambda^*}|\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-\beta}}(\Omega)} \le c_{27}c_{25}^{-1}\bar{c}_\beta(\lambda^*)^{-1}$$

and then

$$\|u_\lambda^*\|_{W^{1,\frac{N}{N-\beta}}(\Omega)} \le c_\beta$$

for some $c_\beta > 0$. Thus, (4.1) holds and (4.2) is obvious by (4.5). This ends the proof. □

4.2. **Stability.** In this subsection, we introduce the stability of the minimal solution u_λ for problem (1.4). By the definition of λ_*, we observe that for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that $u_\lambda \le \theta a$. Therefore, by the fact that $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$ and $a \ge \kappa\rho^\gamma$ in Ω, we have that

$$\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} \le \frac{1}{(1-\theta)^3 a^3} \le (1-\theta)^{-3}\kappa^{-3}\rho^{-3\gamma} \le c_{28}\rho^{-2} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \tag{4.7}$$

where $c_{28} > 0$ depends on θ, κ, γ. This enables us to consider the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta - \frac{2\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, that is,

$$\mu_1(\lambda) = \inf_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \frac{\int_\Omega (|\nabla\varphi|^2 - \frac{2\lambda\varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3})dx}{\int_\Omega \varphi^2\, dx}$$

for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. It is well-known that u_λ is stable if $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ and semi-stable if $\mu_1(\lambda) \ge 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \ge \kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$. Suppose that u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4) and v_λ is a super solution of (1.4).*

If $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$, then

$$u_\lambda \le v_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

If $\mu_1(\lambda) = 0$, then

$$u_\lambda = v_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

Proof. We observe that $a > u_\lambda$ in Ω for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and $\mu_1(\lambda)$ is well-defined for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, then it follows the procedure of the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [4] just replacing $\frac{f}{(1-u)^2}$ by $\frac{1}{(a-u)^2}$. □

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \geq \kappa > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3}]$. Let u_λ be the minimal solution of (1.4), then u_λ is stable.*

Proof. We first claim that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_1(\lambda)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and strictly decreasing in $(0, \lambda_*)$. Observing that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is strictly increasing and so is $\lambda \mapsto \frac{2\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}$, which implies that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_1(\lambda)$ is strictly decreasing in $(0, \lambda_*)$. Let $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_*$ and ϕ_{λ_2} be the achieved function of $\mu_1(\lambda_2)$ with $\|\phi_{\lambda_2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mu_1(\lambda_1) - \mu_1(\lambda_2) &\leq \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla \phi_{\lambda_2}|^2 - \frac{2\lambda_1 \phi_{\lambda_2}^2}{(a-u_{\lambda_1})^3} \right) dx \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla \phi_{\lambda_2}|^2 - \frac{2\lambda_2 \phi_{\lambda_2}^2}{(a-u_{\lambda_2})^3} \right) dx \\ &\leq 2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \int_\Omega \frac{\phi_{\lambda_2}^2}{(a-u_{\lambda_2})^3} dx, \end{aligned}$$

thus, the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_1(\lambda)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.

We next prove that u_λ is stable and $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ for $\lambda > 0$ small. It follows by [10, Theorem 1] that there exists constant $c_{29} > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \varphi^2 \rho^{-2} dx \leq c_{29} \int_\Omega |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{4.8}$$

For $\lambda < \lambda_*$, it follows from (4.7) and (4.8) that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{2\lambda \varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} dx \leq 2\lambda c_{28} \int_\Omega \varphi^2 \rho^{-2} dx \leq 2\lambda c_{28} c_{29} \int_\Omega |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

For $\lambda > 0$ small such that $2\lambda c_{28} c_{29} < 1$, we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{2\lambda \varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} dx < \int_\Omega |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\},$$

that is, $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ and u_λ is stable if $\lambda > 0$ small.

Finally, we prove that u_λ is stable for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. We have obtained that $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ for $\lambda > 0$ small and the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_1(\lambda)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, strictly decreasing in $(0, \lambda_*)$, so if there exists $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda_*)$ such that $\mu_1(\lambda_0) = 0$, then $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$. Letting $\lambda_1 \in (\lambda_0, \lambda_*)$, the minimal solution u_{λ_1} is a super solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{\lambda_0}{(a-u)^2} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

and it infers from Lemma 4.1 that

$$u_{\lambda_1} = u_{\lambda_0},$$

which contradicts that the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is strictly increasing. Therefore, $\mu_1(\lambda) > 0$ and u_λ is stable for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. □

4.3. **Particular case that $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$.** In this subsection, we study further on properties of the minimal solution when $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \geq \kappa > 0$, $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$. Then $\lambda^* = \lambda_*$.*

Proof. For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, by (2.10) and Lemma 2.1, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} a - u_\lambda &\geq (\lambda^* - \lambda)\mathbb{G}_\Omega[a^{-2}] \\ &\geq c_{30}(\lambda^* - \lambda)\rho^\gamma \geq c_{31}(\lambda^* - \lambda)a, \end{aligned}$$

then there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that $u_\lambda \leq \theta a$ in Ω. It follows by Lemma 2.2 and the definition of λ_* that $\lambda_* = \lambda^*$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that $a \in C^\gamma(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies (1.3) and (1.5) with $c_0 \geq \kappa > 0$, $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$ and u_{λ^*} is given by (1.6). Then u_{λ^*} is a semi-stable weak solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$.*

Proof. When $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, by Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.2, we have that u_λ is stable for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, that is,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{2\lambda\varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}dx < \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Let $\varphi = \mathbb{G}_\Omega[1]$, we have that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\rho^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}dx < c_{39}\lambda^{-1}.$$

Since the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \frac{\rho^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}$ is strictly increasing and bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$, then

$$\frac{\rho^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} \to \frac{\rho^2}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^3} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \lambda^* \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega)$$

and for any $\varphi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$,

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\lambda^*} \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda\varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}dx = \int_\Omega \frac{\lambda^*\varphi^2}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^3}dx$$

Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{2\lambda^*\varphi^2}{(a-u_{\lambda^*})^3}dx \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^2(\Omega),$$

by the fact that $C_c^2(\Omega)$ is dense in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, then u_{λ^*} is semi-stable. □

We next improve the regularity of u_{λ^*} and prove when $1 \leq N \leq 7$, the extremal solution u_{λ^*} is a classical solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$. To this end, we need the following Lemma, which is inspired by [4].

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\Omega = B_1(0)$ and $a(x) = \kappa(1-|x|^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ with $\kappa > 0$. Let u be a weak solution of (1.4) satisfying for any compact set $K \subset B_1(0)$, there exists $c_{32} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\frac{1}{a-u}\|_{L^{\frac{3N}{2}}(K)} \leq c_{32}. \tag{4.9}$$

Then there exists $c_{33} > 0$ depending on K such that

$$\inf_{x\in K}(a(x) - u(x)) > c_{33}. \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. By (4.9), we have that

$$\frac{1}{(a-u)^2} \in L^{\frac{3N}{4}}(K)$$

and then $u \in W^{2,\frac{3N}{4}}(K)$ and by Sobolev's Theorem, we deduce that $u \in C^{\frac{2}{3}}(K')$ with K' compact set in interior point set of K. We next show that $u < a$ in $B_1(0)$. Indeed, if not, there exists $x_0 \in B_1(0)$ such that $u(x_0) = a(x_0)$. For compact set $K \subset B_1(0)$ containing x_0, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |a(x) - u(x)| &\le |a(x) - a(x_0)| + |u(x) - u(x_0)| + |u(x_0) - a(x_0)| \\ &= |a(x) - a(x_0)| + |u(x) - u(x_0)| \le c_{34}|x - x_0|^{\frac{2}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\int_K \frac{1}{(a-u)^{\frac{3N}{2}}} dx \ge c_{35} \int_K |x - x_0|^{-\frac{3N}{2}\cdot\frac{2}{3}} dx = \infty,$$

which contradicts (4.9). Therefore, (4.10) holds. □

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that $1 \le N \le 7$, $\Omega = B_1(0)$, the function a satisfies (3.1) with $\kappa > 0$ and $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, u_{λ^*} is given by (1.6). Then u_{λ^*} is a classical solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$.*

Proof. Since the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is strictly increasing and bounded by a, then from (1.5) and Lemma 4.3, we only have to improve the regularity of u_{λ^*} in any compact set of $B_1(0)$. For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, we know that u_λ is stable, then

$$\int_{B_1(0)} \frac{2\lambda\varphi^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} dx < \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(B_1(0)) \setminus \{0\}. \tag{4.11}$$

We claim that the minimal solutions u_λ is radially symmetric for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*]$. Indeed, the minimal solution u_λ could be approximated by the sequence of functions

$$v_n = \lambda \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{1}{(a - v_{n-1})^2}] \quad \text{with} \quad v_0 = 0.$$

It follows by radially symmetry of v_{n-1} and a that v_n is radially symmetry and then u_λ is radially symmetric. Then u_{λ^*} is radially symmetric.

By (4.2), there exists a sequence $\{r_n\}_n \subset (0,1)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} r_n = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a(r_n) - u_{\lambda^*}(r_n) > 0.$$

Otherwise, there exists $r \in (0,1)$ such that

$$a - u_{\lambda^*} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus B_r(0),$$

which contradicts (4.2).

Let us denote

$$\varphi_\theta = \begin{cases} (a-u_\lambda)^\theta - \epsilon_\lambda^\theta & \text{in} \quad B_{r_n}(0), \\ 0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus B_{r_n}(0), \end{cases}$$

where $\theta \in (-2-\sqrt{6}, 0)$ and $\epsilon_\lambda = a(r_n) - u_\lambda(r_n)$. We observe that $\varphi_\theta \in H_0^1(B_1(0))$. It follows by (4.11) with φ_θ, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{r_n}(0)} \frac{2\lambda[(a-u_\lambda)^\theta - \epsilon_\lambda^\theta]^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3} dx &\le \int_{B_{r_n}(0)} |\nabla((a-u_\lambda)^\theta)|^2 dx \\ &= \theta^2 \int_{B_{r_n}(0)} (a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-2} |\nabla(a-u_\lambda)|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since u_λ is the minimal solution of (1.4), then

$$-\Delta(a-u_\lambda) = -\Delta a - \frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2} \quad \text{in} \quad B_{r_n}(0). \tag{4.13}$$

Multiplying (4.13) by $\frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}[(a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-1} - \epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta-1}]$ and applying integration by parts yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}[-\Delta a - \frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}][(a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-1} - \epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta-1}]dx \\
&\quad = \frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)} \nabla(a-u_\lambda)\cdot\nabla\left((a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-1}\right)dx \\
&\quad = -\theta^2\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}(a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-2}|\nabla(a-u_\lambda)|^2dx,
\end{aligned}$$

then together with (4.12), we deduce that

$$\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{2\lambda[(a-u_\lambda)^\theta - \epsilon_\lambda^\theta]^2}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}dx \le \frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}[\Delta a + \frac{\lambda}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}][(a-u_\lambda)^{2\theta-1} - \epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta-1}]dx,$$

thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda(2-\frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta})\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-2\theta}}dx \le \int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{4\lambda\epsilon_\lambda^\theta}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-\theta}}dx - \int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{2\lambda\epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta}}{(a-u_\lambda)^3}dx \\
&+\frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{\Delta a}{(a-u_\lambda)^{1-2\theta}}dx - \frac{\theta^2\epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta-1}}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\Delta a dx - \frac{\theta^2\lambda}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{\epsilon_\lambda^{2\theta-1}}{(a-u_\lambda)^2}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the mapping $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is strictly increasing, we have that

$$\epsilon_\lambda = a(r_n) - u_\lambda(r_n) \ge a(r_n) - u_{\lambda^*}(r_n) := \varepsilon_n > 0$$

and it infers by $a(x) = \kappa(1-|x|^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}$,

$$|\Delta a| \le C_n \quad \text{in} \quad B_{r_n}(0)$$

for some $C_n > 0$, then letting $\theta \in (-2-\sqrt{6}, 0)$, we have that $2 - \frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta} > 0$ and by Hölder inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda(2-\frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta})\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-2\theta}}dx \\
&\le \int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{4\lambda\epsilon_\lambda^\theta}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-\theta}}dx + \frac{\theta^2}{1-2\theta}\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{C_n}{(a-u_\lambda)^{1-2\theta}}dx + \frac{\theta^2\varepsilon_n^{2\theta-1}}{1-2\theta}C_n|B_{r_n}(0)| \\
&\le 4\lambda^*\varepsilon_n^\theta|B_1(0)|^{\frac{-\theta}{3-2\theta}}\left(\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-2\theta}}dx\right)^{\frac{3-\theta}{3-2\theta}} \\
&\quad +C_n|B_1(0)|^{\frac{2}{3-2\theta}}\left(\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-2\theta}}dx\right)^{\frac{1-2\theta}{3-2\theta}} + \frac{\theta^2\varepsilon_n^{2\theta-1}}{1-2\theta}C_n|B_1(0)|
\end{aligned}$$

thus, there exists $c_{44} > 0$ independent on λ such that

$$\int_{B_{r_n}(0)}\frac{1}{(a-u_\lambda)^{3-2\theta}}dx \le c_{44}. \tag{4.14}$$

When $1 \le N \le 7$, $\frac{3N}{2} \le 3 - 2\theta$ for some $\theta \in (-2 - \sqrt{6}, 0)$, then by Lemma 4.3, we have that u_λ has uniformly in $C^{2,\beta}_{loc}(B_1(0))$ with $\beta < \gamma$, then u_{λ^*} is a classical solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$ and $a - u_{\lambda^*} > 0$ in $B_1(0)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Proposition 4.1 shows that u_{λ^*} is a weak solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$. The stability of u_λ follows by Proposition 4.2 for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$. When $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$, the stability and regularity of u_{λ^*} see Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4. □

Acknowledgements: H. Chen is supported by NSFC, No: 11401270. F. Zhou is supported by NSFC, No: 11271133.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Bernstein and A. Pelesko, Modeling MEMS and NEMS, *Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL,* (2002).
[2] M. F. Bidaut-Véron and L. Vivier, An elliptic semilinear equation with source term involving boundary measures: the subcritical case, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 16*, 477-513 (2000).
[3] H. Brezis and J. Vaiquez, Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problem, *Rev. Mat. Univ. Comp. Madrid 10*, 442-469 (1997).
[4] N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, On the partial differential equations of electrostatic MEMS Devices: Stationary case, *SIAM J. Math. Anal. 38*, 1423-1449 (2007).
[5] Y. Guo, On the partial differential equations of electrostatic MEMS devices III: refined touchdown behavior, *J. Diff. Eq. 244*, 2277-2309 (2008).
[6] J. Guo, B. Hu and C. Wang, A nonlocal quenching problem arising in micro-electro mechanical system, *Quat. Appl. Math. 67*, 725-734 (2009).
[7] Y. Guo, Z. Pan and M. Ward, Touchdown and pull-in voltage behavior of a MEMS device with varying dielectric properties, *SIAM J. Appl. Math. 66(1)*, 309-339 (2005).
[8] F. Lin and Y. Yang, Nonlinear non-local elliptic equation modelling electrostatic actuation, *Proc. R. Soc. A 463*, 1323-1337 (2007).
[9] X. Luo, D. Ye and F. Zhou, Regularity of the extremal solution for some elliptic problems with singular nonlinearity and advection, *J. Diff. Eq. 251*, 2082-2099 (2011).
[10] T. Matskewich and P. Sobolevskii, The best possible constant in generalized Hardy's inequality for convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, *Nonlinear Anal. 28*, 1601-1610 (1997).
[11] H. Nathanson, W. Newell, R. Wickstrom and J. Davis, The resonant gate transistor, *IEEE Trans. on Elect Devices 14*, 117-133 (1967).
[12] A. Pelesko, Mathematical modeling of electrostatic MEMS with tailores dielectric properties, *SIAM J. Appl. Math. 62(3)*, 888-908 (2002).
[13] J. Wei, D. Ye, F. Zhou, Analysis of boundary bubbling solutions for an anisotropic Emden-Fowler equation, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Analyse Non Linéaire 25*, 425-447 (2008).
[14] D. Ye and F. Zhou, Boundedness of the extremal solution for semilinear elliptic problems, *Commun. Contemp. Math. 4*, 547-558 (2002).
[15] D. Ye and F. Zhou, On a general family of nonautonomous elliptic and parabolic equations, *Calc. Var. PDE 37*, 259-274 (2010).